

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
10
11 Plaintiff,
12 v.
13 SAMER KARAWI,
14 Defendant.

Case No. CR04-398RSL

ORDER DENYING
MOTION FOR EARLY
TERMINATION OF
SUPERVISED RELEASE

15 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion for Early Termination of
16 Supervised Release." Dkt. # 245. The Court has considered the parties' memoranda and the
17 remainder of the record. For the following reasons, the motion is DENIED.

18 On October 7, 2005, defendant was sentenced to 144 months' imprisonment and three
19 years of supervised release. During the time defendant spent in custody, he completed a number
20 of vocational courses and obtained several training certificates as a result. Since his February
21 2017 release, he has continued to undertake training and has begun work installing
22 communication and technology systems. He also appears to have engaged with his family and
23 taken a role in supporting his elderly father. The government opposes defendant's motion due to
24 his limited but serious criminal history, which includes a conviction for second-degree assault
25 unrelated to this conviction.

26 Under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e), the Court may, after considering a subset of sentencing
27 factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), terminate a term of supervised release after at least one
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EARLY
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE - 1

1 year “if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and
2 the interest of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). When deciding whether to grant a request for
3 early termination of supervised release, the Court “enjoys discretion to consider a wide range of
4 circumstances.” United States v. Emmett, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014).

5 The Court applauds defendant’s progress during his first year of supervised release, but
6 the Court ultimately considers this request premature. Defendant’s educational accomplishments
7 while in custody, his reintegration into the community since release, and his commitment to
8 working and supporting his family are all praiseworthy. The Court invites defendant to renew
9 his request for termination in February 2019 when he will have completed two years of
10 supervised release. For the foregoing reasons, the motion, Dkt. # 245, is DENIED.

11 DATED this 31st day of May, 2018.

12
13
14 

15 Robert S. Lasnik
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28